

ANNUAL REPORT FOR FY 2001

UNITED STATES – ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (US-AEP)

March 4, 2002

Please Note:

The attached RESULTS INFORMATION is from the FY 2002 Annual report, and was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on the cover page.

The Annual Report is a “pre-decisional” USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse

1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200

Arlington, VA 22209-2111

Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106

Fax: 703/351-4039

Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org

Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after July 1, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part III. Performance Narrative	
A. Key Achievements	3
B. Most Important Challenges Faced	4
C. Beneficiaries of USAID Resources	5
D. Results at the Strategic Objective Level	6
E. Results at the Intermediate Results Level	8
F. Results in Terms of USAID's Selected Performance Indicators	11
Part IV. Performance Data Tables and Results Frameworks	12
Part VII. Environmental Compliance	17
Annexes	
C. US-AEP Results Framework	26

Part III – FY 2001 Performance Narrative

A. Key Achievements

FY 2001 was a year of solid accomplishments for the US-AEP. There was notable progress in achieving the US-AEP's one Strategic Objective: *sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia*. The progress was measured in substantial results at both the SO and Intermediate Results level -- results that *exceeded all of the US-AEP's performance targets* for the year. The key achievements in statistical terms were:

- A significant increase in the number of Asian environmental laws and regulations newly passed or further strengthened, and being enforced by the courts.
- Many more local government units and public agencies implementing best urban environmental practices and launching new urban environmental infrastructure projects and improvements.
- Many professional associations and networks established or strengthened to promote the adoption of environmental management systems and cleaner industrial production.
- A substantial increase in the number of new and continuing partnerships (alliances) between U.S. and Asian institutions.
- A significant contribution (funds leveraged) from the US-AEP's public and private sector implementing partners.
- More than \$109 million in the sale of U.S. environmental equipment and services in Asia.

The positive statistics reflect the US-AEP's success in enabling the public and private sectors in Asia to better protect the environment and improve the economic condition, health and safety of the Asian people. The US-AEP's efforts resulted in significant improvements in water quality, wastewater treatment, solid waste management, and the disposal of medical and other hazardous waste throughout the region. Working in collaboration with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Asian Development Bank, and the World Bank, the US-AEP was instrumental in the nationwide phase-out of leaded gasoline in the Philippines and Vietnam, and in initiating similar air quality improvements in Thailand, Indonesia and Sri Lanka.

The US-AEP's activities relating to Global Climate Change helped reduce greenhouse gasses by promoting resource efficiency, improvements in environmental management, waste minimization and the adoption of renewable energy sources throughout Asia's industrial and urban sectors.

B. Most Important Challenges Faced

For most of the past year the US-AEP had sufficient resources and a relatively stable operating environment. This made it possible to achieve the kind of results that are summarized above and documented in more detail below. However, the program faced two important challenges in FY 2001 and both have carried over into the current fiscal year.

One was the very long time that it took for the US-AEP to “re-bid” its two most important technical support contracts. The process of awarding a new contract to administer the Exchange Program for Sustainable Growth (EPSG), which began in late 1999, was finally concluded with an award to the Institute of International Education (IIE) last June: 19 months later. The process of awarding a new Technical Support Services Contract (TSSC), which also began at the end of 1999, was concluded (though not *finally*) with an award to the Louis Berger Group (LBG) last September: 22 months later.

The long delays in letting the two contracts can be attributed entirely to the vagaries of the USAID procurement process, which necessitated several costly and time-consuming extensions of the existing EPSG and TSSC contracts and reduced the effectiveness of the old contractors. Regrettably, the TSSC award is still not settled. One of the bidders filed an official protest last October, and (five months later) the issue has not yet been resolved. This has created a continuing atmosphere of uncertainty and seriously constrains LBG, the ostensible contract winner, in carrying out its new responsibilities.

The most serious challenge that the US-AEP faced last year – and which it continues to face – is how to deal with the abrupt and unanticipated decision by the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC) to terminate its support for the US-AEP in the ADCs at the end of FY 2001. Since 1994, the DOC has been the US-AEP’s most important implementing partner. The DOC had been funding the costs of the US-AEP Offices of Technology Cooperation in Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia. These programs have accounted for many impressive US-AEP’s achievements over the years.

Projects launched in the ADCs have also served as models for the introduction of similar projects in the six Less Developed Countries (India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam) in which the US-AEP has continued to operate jointly with the DOC, but primarily with USAID funds. But that situation is also changing: the DOC recently announced that it plans to also disassociate itself from the US-AEP in the LDCs, effective next September 30.

Thus, the US-AEP is currently exploring various options for: a) continuing to engage the five ADCs in its activities in the LDCs; and b) establishing a new support structure for the continued operation of its Offices of Technology Cooperation in the six LDCs, and continued support for a modest level of activities in two other LDCs (Nepal and Bangladesh) where there is no US-AEP staffing presence.

Over the past several months, the US-AEP has identified prominent public and private sector entities -- in each of the five ADCs -- which have expressed a strong interest in serving as a US-AEP “liaison” in their countries and establishing an alliance for joint planning and self-funding of activities in the LDCs. A number of very interesting new activities have already been proposed by these potential new partners, e.g., a project in which Singapore will advise and assist Indonesia in improving its solid waste management. Memoranda of Understanding are currently being drafted and negotiated to spell out the precise terms of their engagement with the US-AEP.

While these are promising developments, there is no denying that the US-AEP’s level of engagement with the five ADCs will be substantially reduced and the impressive results that the US-AEP has been recording in the ADCs are a thing of the past. It should also be noted that the US-AEP considers the newly evolving arrangements in the ADCs to be a pilot effort that will be carefully reviewed and re-evaluated after one year. These efforts may also be adjusted on the basis of the results from the upcoming evaluation of US-AEP.

Efforts to establish a new support structure for the US-AEP Offices of Technology Cooperation in the six LDCs are just getting started and will be focused heavily on forging a new relationship with the USAID Missions in the region.

Other challenges that currently face the US-AEP and impact on its ability to produce the kind of results in FY 2002 and beyond that were achieved last year include:

- The recent retirement of the Executive Director, the impending retirement of the long-serving Deputy Director, and other potential departures of key US-AEP and partner personnel, that represent a significant loss of continuity and institutional memory.
- The expiration later this year of the Cooperative Agreements with the Council of State Governments (CSG) and the National Association of State Development Agencies (NASDA), which requires an assessment of the continuing relationship to be maintained with these two important domestic partners that have enabled the US-AEP tap the public and private sector resources of the 50 U.S. states.

C. Beneficiaries of USAID Resources

There are various ways to precisely count the US-AEP's beneficiaries. For example, in FY 2001:

- A total of 1967 public and private sector *institutions* (621 American and 1346 Asian) were engaged in one or more US-AEP-supported activities, with more than half focused on activities in three sectors: waste water, air pollution and industrial environmental management.
- A total of 671 *Asians* (554 male and 117 female) participated in one or more US-AEP-supported educational exchanges, which resulted in the knowledge transfer of "best practices" in all of the environmental sectors.
- A total of 297 *Asians* (250 male and 47 female) participated in US-AEP-supported trade shows in the U.S. and were exposed to the latest environmental technology and services offered by the American private sector.
- A reported 12,000 *people of all ages* in Bhuj, India, were the direct beneficiaries of US-AEP humanitarian assistance, when their water supply was contaminated by a devastating earthquake.
- An estimated 370,000 Indonesians were the beneficiaries of a US-AEP program (in collaboration with USAID/Jakarta) that kept clean water flowing to 50 rural water enterprises that were on the brink of bankruptcy last year.

However, there were also *tens of millions* of men, women and children all over Asia, whose numbers have not been carefully counted, whose health and economic condition were improved as a result of one or more US-AEP programs. For example, the entire populations of the Philippines and Vietnam benefited from the successful US-AEP effort to eliminate leaded gas in those countries. Five million citizens of Singapore will soon benefit from the construction a new state-of-the art wastewater facility, for which an American company was awarded contracts for the feasibility study and engineering design, with US-AEP assistance.

D. Results at the Strategic Objective Level

1. Performance Indicator 1a: *The number of new, continuing and self-sustaining U.S.-Asian partnerships.*

The results for this indicator are measured in terms of three milestones, with one point awarded for a) new partnerships (alliances) that were created between U.S. and Asian public institutions and NGOs; b) partnerships that were created in earlier years that continued to address Asia's environmental and development problems, with US-AEP support; and c) partnerships that continued to operate without US-AEP support, i.e., they became self-sustaining.

The FY 2001 target – the total number of points for the three milestones – was 110. The actual result was a total of 304 points, including 92 new partnerships, 200 continuing partnerships and 12 partnerships that became self-sustaining. Thus, the target for partnerships, which have been the hallmark of the US-AEP's success over the years, was greatly *exceeded*.

The following on the following page shows the partnership results by country:

Country	New	Continuing	Self-sustaining	Total
India	25	58	2	85
Philippines	10	26	1	37
Thailand	9	24	3	36
Malaysia	11	15	1	27
Vietnam	17	9	1	27
Hong Kong	6	18	1	25
Sri Lanka	12	12		24
Indonesia	1	14	2	17
Taiwan		12		12
Singapore	1	8	1	10
Korea		2		2
Nepal		2		2
Total	92	200	12	304

A representative list of the Asian institutions with which new partnerships were created includes: Friends of the Earth, an NGO based in Hong Kong; the Center for Environmental Education and the Green Environmental Service Cooperative in India; the Construction Industry Development Board and the Department of Environment in Malaysia; the International Institute for Energy Conservation and the Partnership for Clean Air in the Philippines; the International Water Management Institute in Sri Lanka; the Waste Management Association in Singapore; and the Hanoi Institute of Social and Economic Development Studies in Vietnam.

A New Generation of Environmental Lawyers

US-AEP began work in 2001 with Thammasat University in Thailand to strengthen its nascent environmental law graduate program by facilitating a partnership with George Washington University's Environmental Law Program. Educational exchanges between the two

The 92 new partnerships in FY 2001 also included four between coalitions of U.S. state and Asian institutions that were created with grant support from one of the US-AEP's major implementing partners, the Council of State Governments: Arizona-Sri Lanka; California-Vietnam; Colorado-Vietnam; and Idaho-Malaysia. A partnership was also established between the West Coast Chapter of the Air & Waste Management Association and a new A&WMA Chapter in Thailand.

Throughout the year the US-AEP continued its joint activities and fruitful policy dialogues with its most important regional partners, including the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Mayors Asia-Pacific Environmental Summit, and the Greening of Industry Network-Asia. FY 2001 also saw a number of new initiatives in collaboration with the U.S. Alliance to Save Energy and the International City/County Management Association, and improved industrial environmental projects throughout the

region in conjunction with such multi-nationals as Nike, Ford Motor, United Technologies and Bank of America.

With the recent closure of US-AEP Offices of Technology Cooperation in the five ADCs, it will be interesting to see how many of the partnerships in those countries continue to operate on a self-sustaining basis in FY 2002 and beyond. However, it will be difficult, absent a staffing presence in the ADCs, for the US-AEP to obtain good information on what happens to those partnerships, which were included in last year's results. Given this situation, the FY 2002 target for this indicator been adjusted downward and calls for 50 new and 120 continuing partnerships.

2. Indicator 1b: *The percentage of total resources (used to support US-AEP activities) that are leveraged from non-USAID resources.*

The target for this indicator is that at least 33% of the total resources available to the US-AEP are leveraged from its partners. In FY 2001 the ANE Bureau provided \$16,062,000 in funding for US-AEP activities. Public and private sector partners contributed another \$9,110,451 to help support the US-AEP's activities. This works out to 36%, in relationship to the USAID funding, and indicates that the target was *exceeded* by three percentage points.

The major contributions included: \$908,160 from the Department of Commerce (DOC), primarily for its support of the US-AEP staff in the ADCs; \$2,467,672 in funding and in-kind support from the U.S. and Asian participants in the Overseas Program Fund, administered by the National Association of State Development Agencies (NASDA); \$1,692,121 in funding and in-kind support from the participants in the State Environmental Initiative, administered by the Council of State Governments (CSG); and \$3,007,948 in funding and in-kind support from the participants in the Exchange Program for Sustainable Growth administered by the Institute of International Education (IIE).

Although the DOC withdrew its funding for the US-AEP at the end of FY 2001, the FY 2002 target for this indicator remains at 33%. The total amount of the funds and in-kind support leveraged by the US-AEP since 1992 now stands at \$172,123,421.

E. Results at the Intermediate Results Level

1. Indicator 1.1a: *The number of environmental policies, laws and regulations strengthened through US-AEP activities.*

The results for this indicator are measure in terms of three milestones, with one point awarded for: a) new/strengthened policies or laws; b) new strengthened regulations; and c) improved compliance with regulations or enforcement actions taken. The FY 2001 target – the total number of points for the three milestones – was 22. The final “score” of 35 *exceeded* the target and included the following breakout:

Country	Milestone # 1	Milestone # 2	Milestone # 3	Total
Hong Kong	1			1
India		3	1	4
Indonesia	1		4	5
Malaysia			1	1
Philippines				
Singapore	4	2	1	7
Sri Lanka		1	1	2
Taiwan	1			1
Thailand	2	2	3	7
Vietnam	1	3	1	5
	12	11	12	35

The results for Milestone #1 included: developing a national water management policy in Indonesia; strengthening the “polluter pays” policy in Hong Kong; strengthening the Clean Water, Clean Air, and Solid Waste Management Acts in the Philippines; developing a bi-lateral U.S.-Singapore Agreement on Solid Waste Disposal; developing a bi-lateral U.S.-Philippines Agreement on Trans-Boundary Movement of Hazardous Waste; support for a national policy dialogue on alternative/renewable energy sources in Taiwan; and developing Thailand’s National Pollution Prevention Plan as well as its new Public Consultation Law.

The results for Milestone #2 included: strengthening India’s regulations regarding the disposal of solid, hazardous and medical waste; developing new regulations for the disposal of used motor oil in Sri Lanka; revising Vietnam’s regulations on violations of the national Environmental Law; developing water pricing regulations for Vietnam; developing environmentally friendly procurement regulations in the Philippines; and drafting the implementing regulations on “Green Fleets” in Thailand.

The results for Milestone #3 included: strengthening the capacity of India’s court that enforces its environmental regulations; facilitating public outreach for compliance and enforcement of Indonesia’s air quality legislation; strengthening the compliance capacity of the Philippines’ Department of Environment and Natural Resources; strengthening air quality monitoring capacity in Sri Lanka; strengthening the

Ford Motor Company Supports Vietnam’s Phase Out of Leaded Gasoline

Falling on the heels of US-AEP’s success in the Philippines, US-AEP worked in partnership with the USEPA, the World Bank and the Government of Vietnam to eliminate leaded gasoline in Vietnam. At the end of April 2001, the Government of Vietnam officially announced a switch to an unleaded gasoline later that year – a decision that came three years earlier than had been initially planned. The culmination of two years work, US-AEP’s efforts brought together officials from the Philippines and Vietnam in early 2001 to discuss the experience of the Philippine government and explore communication strategies. Last year, US-AEP also brought together the Ford Motor Company with private and public experts

capacity of judicial bodies in Thailand and Vietnam to make informed judgments on the enforcement of environmental regulations; and strengthening the capacity to enforce swine waste management in Malaysia.

2. Indicator 1.2a: *The number of local government units (LGUs) and public agencies implementing new or improved urban environmental management practices, policies and infrastructure projects.*

This indicator was used for the first time in FY 2001 and no target was set. The FY 2001 data is intended to establish the baseline for the targets to be achieved in FY 2002 and beyond. The FY 2001 result was a total of 194 LGUs and public agencies, in the following six countries:

India: 21 municipal corporations throughout the country implementing improved solid waste management practices.

Indonesia: 83 local water enterprises implementing various clean water activities, including customer satisfaction surveys, cost reduction measures, integration of rural women's support groups, and instructing new water enterprise directors; and support for a public awareness program in Jakarta to teach the public about the health effects of leaded gasoline.

Philippines: 34 municipalities in Metro-Manila and other major cities implementing integrated solid waste management projects.

Sri Lanka: 4 projects in Colombo to improve solid and medical waste management, obtain air quality management data, and strengthen the capacity to control vehicular emissions.

Thailand: 48 municipalities, including Metro-Bangkok (implementing the Green Fleets program, the motorcycle upgrade project, and public participation in solid waste management) and Chiang Mai (developing an air quality master planning process, in conjunction with the Maryland Department of Environment); and strengthening the capacity of the national Pollution Control Department to improve water quality on the Tachin River, solid waste management operator certification and licensing, and waste-water operation regulation.

Vietnam: 4 municipalities, including a Seattle-Haiphong partnership (alliance) to upgrade the urban infrastructure, and strengthening the capacity of officials in Ho Chi Minh City to manage an air quality measuring system.

Mayors Asia-Pacific Environmental Summit

US-AEP has been supportive of the Mayors Asia-Pacific Environmental Summit (MAPES) since its inception in 1999. MAPES brings government officials, business representatives, and NGOs from Pacific Rim cities together to share information, experiences and strategies for improving urban environmental management. The 2001 MAPES meeting was held in Honolulu, co-sponsored by US-AEP, the City of Honolulu, the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), the International City and County Management Association (ICMA), and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

What makes MAPES unique is the tradition of mayors and city officials pledging specific actions to improve urban environments with commitments that US-AEP supports. Mayors from 27 different cities made individual commitments for environmental improvements, from building new wastewater and waste management facilities, to expanding green space in their cities, to developing long-term environmental plans for

3. Indicator 1.3.2a: *The number of US-AEP-supported networks and associations established and/or strengthened to promote environmental management systems and cleaner industrial production.*

This indicator was also used for the first time in FY 2001 and no target was set. The FY 2001 data is intended to establish the baseline for the targets to be achieved in FY 2002 and beyond. The FY 2001 result was a total of 20 networks and associations established or strengthened, primarily in the areas of cleaner industrial production, air pollution, energy efficiency and environmental management. The breakout by countries was: India (2), Indonesia (1), Malaysia (2), Philippines (6), Sri Lanka (3), Singapore (1), Taiwan (1), Thailand (3) and Vietnam (1).

In the Philippines, the Environmental Management Accounting Network – Asia Pacific was created as a result of the US-AEP's support to the Confederation of Asia Pacific Accountants Convention. In Thailand, the US-AEP helped create and strengthen two associations to promote energy efficiency: the Energy Efficiency Development Association and the Energy Conservation Entrepreneurs Association. Other networks and associations strengthened included: Indian Environmental Association; Chemical Consumer Protection Association of India; Indonesian Consumers Association; Taiwan Bankers Association; Industrial Ecology Asia Network (based in the Philippines); Energy Management Association of the Philippines; Thai Network for Eco-Efficiency and Cleaner Production; and Conservation and Environment Network of Vietnam.

4. Indicator 1.4a: *The dollar value of US-AEP-assisted sales of U.S. environmental equipment and services.*

The FY 2001 target for sales was \$70 million. The confirmed sales of \$109,518,961 *exceeded* the target by almost \$40 million and raised the overall total of US-AEP-assisted sales to more than \$1.4 billion. The largest transaction was a \$50 million contract awarded to Global Plasma Systems Group, USA, to build a hazardous waste treatment facility in Malaysia. It will also serve as a pilot plant for the construction of similar facilities in other Asian countries.

There were 125 US-AEP-assisted sales, broken out by environmental sectors as follows: air pollution (\$3,855,760); clean water (\$38,743,976); waste water (\$6,411,283); solid waste (\$4,335,738); medical waste (\$1,306,750); energy (\$673,454); hazardous waste (\$50,542,260); environmental management (\$3,630,654); and instrumentation (\$19,086). Of the 125 American companies, 40 made their first environmental sales in Asia through US-AEP assistance.

Indiana Company Helps Improve Water Management in Metro Manila

Vast quantities of treated drinking water are lost daily by municipal water systems through leaks, or illegal tapping, and this deprives consumers of a basic public health necessity. One of two primary water concessions in Manila – the Mayiland concession -- suffered a 60% loss of water through leaks and illegal tapings. With US-AEP's assistance, in 2001 the concession signed an agreement with the Ford Meter Box Company, Inc. of Indiana to purchase \$4.4 million in equipment, repair clamps and service connections. This

This was the breakout by country: Hong Kong (9 sales for \$25,419,194); India (28 sales for \$3,827,103); Indonesia (2 sales for \$804,000); Korea (4 sales for \$2,618,000); Malaysia (5 sales for \$50,343,476); Philippines (20 sales for \$8,556,187); Singapore (8 sales for \$6,846,000); Sri Lanka (14 sales for \$903,818); Taiwan (5 sales for \$63,765); Vietnam (6 sales for \$146,901); and Asian Development Bank projects (8 sales for \$7,931,268).

Of the sales, 31 (\$85,290,435) were in the five ADCs, while 94 (\$24,228,526) were in the LDCs. Over the years the ADCs have been a lucrative market for US-AEP-assisted sales. Some sales in the ADCs that can be attributed to US-AEP assistance may still occur in FY 2002; but it will be difficult to obtain that information. The target for sales in FY 2002 *had been* set at \$70 million,

the same as in FY 2001. Given the current situation, the FY 2002 target has been reduced to a modest \$25 million.

4. Indicator 1.4b: *The number of US-AEP-assisted business transactions, other than sales, between U.S. and Asian companies.*

The FY 2001 target was 11. With 23 transactions reported, the target was greatly *exceeded*. They included signing of business deals between U.S. and Asian companies for: 14 agent-distributorships; six joint ventures; two contracts; and one licensing agreement. There were eight deals in India, five in Thailand, three in Singapore, two each in Vietnam and the Philippines, and one each in Indonesia, Malaysia and Sri Lanka. In terms of the environmental sectors, the transactions were broken out as follows: waste water (8); environmental management (2); hazardous waste (2); solid waste (2); air pollution (3); clean water (5); and “other” (1).

The FY 2002 target for this indicator remains at 11. This seems reasonable, since the results last year (when the US-AEP was still operating in the five ADCs) were more than double the target.

F. Results in Terms of USAID’s Selected Performance Indicators

Although they were developed independently, a number of the US-AEP’s indicators – while worded somewhat differently – actually correspond to USAID’s Selected Performance Indicators. As Table I in Section IV (A) shows, two US-AEP indicators, 1a (partnerships) and 1d (funds leveraged) correspond to the two USAID indicators under Pillar I. As documented in Section D (1-2) above, both of the US-AEP’s targets for those indicators were exceeded.

With respect to Pillar II, the US-AEP’s one Strategic Objective directly supports Approach # 5, and all the targets relating to the US-AEP’s seven indicators at the SO and Intermediate Results level were exceeded. Two of those seven indicators, 1.4a (sales) and 1.4b (business transactions other than sales) relate directly to USAID Objective 1 under Pillar II. It is fair to say that all of the seven US-AEP indicators, whose targets were exceeded in FY 2001, also relate directly to USAID Objective 5 under Pillar II (world environment protected).

The US-AEP has no indicators to measure results in terms of USAID Objective 6 (humanitarian assistance). However, when the city of Bhuj, India suffered a devastating earthquake on January 26, 2001, which contaminated its water supply, US-AEP was able to quickly mobilize an American firm (Water Systems International, from Washington, D.C.) to install two water purification plants within 48 hours time. The Indian Prime Minister’s Office cooperated with the US-AEP in arranging an airlift of WSI’s equipment and other relief materials, which provided 60,000 liters of clean water per day to 12,000 people in two refugee camps outside the city. WSI realized a sale worth \$40,000 in this humanitarian intervention, for which the US-AEP was highly praised by the Minister of Gujarat Province.

Part IV – FY 2001 Performance Data Tables and Results Frameworks

A. Performance Data

The new Table I on Selected Performance Indicators follows on the next four pages.

Table 1: Annual Report Selected Performance Measures				FY 2001	
Indicator (all data should pertain to FY or CY 01)		OU Response		Fund Account	Data Quality Factors
Pillar I: Global Development Alliance: GDA serves as a catalyst to mobilize the ideas, efforts, and resources of the public sector, corporate America and non-governmental organizations in support of shared objectives					
1	Did your operating unit achieve a significant result working in alliance with the public sector or NGOs?	Yes			This indicator corresponds to US-AEP indicator 1a. Its data quality was reviewed in calendar 2000 and 2001.
2	a. How many alliances did you implement in 2001? (list partners)	92			
	b. How many alliances do you plan to implement in FY 2002?	50			
3	What amount of funds has been leveraged by the alliances in relationship to USAID's contribution?	\$9,110,451 leveraged, or 36% in relation to USAID funding			This indicator corresponds to US-AEP indicator 1d. Its data quality was reviewed in calendar 2000 and 2001.
Pillar II: Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade: USAID works to improve country economic performance using five approaches: (1) liberalizing markets, (2) improving agriculture, (3) supporting microenterprise, (4) ensuring primary education, and (5) protecting the environment and improving energy efficiency.					
4	If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the EGAT pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets?	Exceed			US-AEP's SO is linked to this Objective and all of its seven targets for FY 2001 were exceeded.
USAID Objective 1: Critical, private markets expanded and strengthened					
5	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes			This indicator corresponds to US-AEP indicators 1.4a and 1.4b. Data quality reviewed in calendar 2000 and 2001.
USAID Objective 2: More rapid and enhanced agricultural development and food security encouraged					
6	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?		N/A		

USAID Objective 3: Access to economic opportunity for the rural and urban poor expanded and made more equitable					
7	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A			
USAID Objective 4: Access to quality basic education for under-served populations, especially for girls and women, expanded					
8	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A			
9	a. Number of children enrolled in primary schools affected by USAID basic education programs (2001 actual)	N/A			
	b. Number of children enrolled in primary schools affected by USAID basic education programs (2002 target)	N/A			
USAID Objective 5: World's environment protected					
10	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes			US-AEP's SO is linked to this Objective and all of its seven targets for FY 2001 were exceeded.
11	a. Hectares under Approved Management Plans (2001 actual)	N/A			
	b. Hectares under Approved Management Plans (2002 target)	N/A			
Pillar III: Global Health: USAID works to: (1) stabilize population, (2) improve child health, (3) improve maternal health, (4) address the HIV/AIDS epidemic, and (5) reduce the threat of other infectious diseases.					
12	If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Global Health pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets?	N/A			
USAID Objective 1: Reducing the number of unintended pregnancies					
13	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A			

USAID Objective 2: Reducing infant and child mortality				
14	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A		
USAID Objective 3: Reducing deaths and adverse health outcomes to women as a result of pregnancy and childbirth				
15	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A		
USAID Objective 4: Reducing the HIV transmission rate and the impact of HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries				
16	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A		
USAID Objective 5: Reducing the threat of infectious diseases of major public health importance				
17	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A		
Pillar IV: Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance				
18	If you have a Strategic Objective or Objectives linked to the Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance Pillar, did it/they exceed, meet, or not meet its/their targets?	N/A		
USAID Objective 1: Rule of law and respect for human rights of women as well as men strengthened				
19	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A		
USAID Objective 2: Credible and competitive political processes encouraged				
20	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A		

USAID Objective 3: The development of politically active civil society promoted						
21	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A				
USAID Objective 4: More transparent and accountable government institutions encouraged						
22	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A				
USAID Objective 5: Conflict						
23	Did your program in a pre-conflict situation achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A				
24	Did your program in a post-conflict situation achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	N/A				
25	Number of refugees and internally displaced persons assisted by USAID	N/A				
USAID Objective 6: Humanitarian assistance following natural or other disasters						
26	Did your program achieve a significant result in the past year that is likely to contribute to this objective?	Yes				Result not related to any US-AEP indicators.
27	Number of beneficiaries	12,000				

B. Data Quality Assessment

The quality of the US-AEP's Performance Indicators was assessed in the summer of 2002 by a consulting team from PricewaterhouseCoopers, as part of its contract to draft the US-AEP's Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP). A second PricewaterhouseCoopers team reviewed and refined the indicators and updated the PMP in the summer of 2001, based on the data that was collected in the first six months of FY 2001.

The abrupt closure of the US-AEP's Offices of Technology Cooperation in the five ADCs on September 30, 2001, had an adverse affect on the data collection process for FY 2001. Some of the offices closed without reporting any data for the second half of the fiscal year. Significantly, all of the FY 2001 targets were met without the missing data.

C. Results Framework

The US-AEP's Results Framework in Annex D has been in effect since the beginning of FY 2000. As the many program and management issues that currently affect the future of the US-AEP are addressed, it appears inevitable that the Results Framework (RF) will require some revisions. Indeed, assuming that the US-AEP is given a new lease on life in the coming months, the revisions to the RF should be based on a new 5-10 year Strategic Plan. The US-AEP's current Plan was drafted in 1995. Given all that has changed in the past seven years, and the decisions on the US-AEP's future that are pending, a completely new Plan should be developed.

Part VII – Environmental Compliance

In view of the fact that all of its activities are directly related to environmental improvement, the US-AEP is exempt from preparing this section of the Annual Report, as it was in the like part of the old Results Review and Resources Request (R4).

U.S.-Asia Environmental (US-AEP) Partnership Results Framework

